



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/934,184	08/21/2001	Andrew Paul Sadler	5181-77301	7668
7590	07/28/2004			
B. Noel Kivlin Conley, Rose, & Tayon, P.C. P.O. Box 398 Austin, TX 78767				
			EXAMINER GREENE, DANIEL L	
			ART UNIT 3621	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/934,184

Applicant(s)

SADLER ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel L. Greene

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/20/2004.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings received on 1/11/02, the drawings are acceptable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-11, 14-29, 32-42 and 44-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bamforth et al U.S. Patent 6,470,394 [Bamforth], and further in view of Perlman U.S. Patent 5,455,865 [Perlman].

The recitations: a method, a program element comprising program code for configuring, a computer-readable medium encoded, a computer system for routing, and a computer network comprising, have not been given patentable weight because it has been held that a preamble is denied the effect of a limitation where the claim is drawn to a method, a system, an apparatus, etc. and the portion of the claim following the preamble is a self-contained description of the method or the system, etc., not depending for completeness upon the introductory clause. *Kropa v. Robie*, 88 USPQ 478 (CCPA 1951)

As per claims 1, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 37, 44, and 45:

Bamforth discloses:

converting a message received from a sender into an internal format comprising at least an attribute part and a data part, Fig. 4.

writing into said attributes part data extracted from said received message; Col. 5, lines 50-67.

Bamforth discloses the claimed invention except for routing said converted message in dependence on the data in said attribute part.

Perlman teaches that it is known in the art to provide routing said converted message in dependence on the data in said attribute part. Col. 10, lines 10-67.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the linking boxes of Bamforth, Fig. 3, with the routing said converted message in dependence on the data in said attribute part of Perlman, in order to insure the right recipients receive their intended data.

As per claims 2, 20, 30, and 38:

Bamforth further discloses:

comprising identifying the format in which the message was received, and writing data identifying that format into said attribute part. Fig. 4.

As per claims 3, 21, and 39:

Bamforth discloses the claimed invention except for determining where to send the message is dependent on the attributes.

Perlman teaches that it is known in the art to provide determining where to send the message is dependent on the attributes.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the universal data routers of Bamforth, Col. 3, lines 1-20, with where to send the message is in the attributes of Perlman, Fig. 2,

As per claims 4, 22 and 40:

Bamforth discloses the claimed invention except for authenticating the identity of the sender of the message.

Perlman teaches that it is known in the art to provide authenticating the identity of the sender of the message. Col. 5, lines 50-65.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the Edifact protocol of Bamforth with the authenticating the identity of the sender of the message of Perlman, in order to validate the authenticity of the message.

As per claims 5, 23, and 41:

Bamforth further discloses:

indicating a set of services to which the message is addressed. Col. 6, Lines 30-46.

As per claims 6, 24, and 42:

Bamforth further discloses:

comprising determining whether the sender is authorized to access at least one service; Col. 6, lines 30-50.

in dependence on the result of said authorization determination, sending the converted message to the identified service. Col. 6, lines 30-50.

As per claim 7:

Bamforth further discloses:

in which said identified service updates the data held in the attribute part of the message. Col. 6, lines 15-50.

As per claims 8 and 25:

Bamforth discloses rules for load balancing and setting codes in the header to facilitate the routing of the message. Bamforth does not specifically teach storing a plurality of routing rules and determining whether the sender is authorized to access at least one service comprises comparing said plurality of routing rules with the attributes of a converted message. However, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the arts to know how to modify the known prior art by incorporating the teachings of Perlman that uses encryption techniques for authorizing actions. Col. 3-4, lines 1-67.

Art Unit: 3621

As per claims 9 and 26:

Bamforth teaches about the concept of the Edifact protocol converting messages and developing a header for the routing of the message. Bamforth further discloses the concept of comparing the data in the different fields to determine the next action. It is well known in the art that a person skilled in the art knows verification of a digital signature. Perlman provides an example of verifying a digital signature. Col. 3-4.

As per claim 10:

Bamforth further discloses:

writing into said attribute part data identifying the received digital signature. Col 5, lines 50-67.

As per claim 11:

Bamforth further discloses:

comprising storing a plurality of routing rules;
comparing the attributes of a converted message with the routing rules;
and routing said converted message in dependence on said comparison.
Col. 5-6.

As per claims 14 and 32:

Bamforth does not expressly show if a transaction identifier is detected, searching for data identifying the status of a transaction by reference to the detected transaction identifier.

However these differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. The searching for data identifying the status of a transaction by reference to the detected transaction identifier steps would be performed the same regardless of the data. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, *see In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to if a transaction identifier is detected, searching for data identifying the status of a transaction by reference to the detected transaction identifier because such data does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the data does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

As per claims 27, 33 and 34:

Bamforth further discloses:

a plurality of applications for converting said received message, said parser selecting at least one of said applications in dependence on the data extracted from said received message. Col. 6, lines 15-67.

As per claims 28 and 35:

Bamforth further discloses:

wherein said data extracted from said received message includes a message type, said parser selecting at least one of said applications in dependence on the type of a message. Col. 6, lines 15-67.

As per claim 29:

Bamforth further discloses:

wherein said data extracted from said received message includes protocol data, and said parser selects at least one of said applications in dependence on the protocol under which the message was received. Col. 6, lines 15-67.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 12, 13, 30-31 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bamforth and Perlman as applied to claims 1-11, 14-29, 32-42 and 44-45 above, and further in view of Ginter et al. U.S. Patent 6,658,568.

5. As per claims 12, 30 and 43:

Bamforth and Perlman disclose the claimed invention except for the searching for a transaction identifier in the received message. Ginter teaches that it is known in the art to provide searching for a transaction identifier in the received message. Col. 94, lines 19-67.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the determination of the content of a message Bamforth and Perlman with the searching for a transaction identifier in the received message of Ginter, in order to provide the correct identity of where the message is to be routed.

As per claims 13 and 31:

Bamforth and Perlman disclose the claimed invention except for allocating a new transaction identifier if no transaction identifier is detected in the received message. Ginter teaches that it is known in the art to provide allocating a new transaction identifier if no transaction identifier is detected in the received message. Col. 95, lines 1-67.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the default function of Bamforth and

Perlman with the allocating a new transaction identifier if no transaction identifier is detected in the received message of Ginter, in order to provide assistance in the processing of a message.

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel L. Greene whose telephone number is 703-306-5539. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thur. 8am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James P. Trammell can be reached on 703-305-9768. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

7/14/04

DLG



JAMES P. TRAMMELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600